

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANDREW PROKOS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

AMERICAN MANAGED IT SERVICES INC., and  
DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No. 1:25-cv-04638 (JLR)

**ORDER**

JENNIFER L. ROCHON, United States District Judge:

Plaintiff Andrew Prokos (“Plaintiff”) initiated this action on June 3, 2025, *see* Dkt. 1, and Defendant American Managed IT Services Inc. (“Defendant”) was served with the Summons and Complaint through the New York Secretary of State on June 17, 2025, *see* Dkt. 9. After Defendant failed to respond to the Complaint by the July 8, 2025 answer deadline, the Court granted Defendant a courtesy extension to answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint no later than July 18, 2025. *See* Dkt. 11. To date, Defendant has not responded to the Complaint and no appearance has been entered on behalf of Defendant.

On July 21, 2025, Defendant’s Chief Executive Officer, Mark Angelisanti, filed a letter informing the Court that Defendant “has made efforts to secure legal representation,” but “ha[s] been unable to retain an attorney whom [it] can afford.” Dkt. 12. Accordingly, Mr. Angelisanti seeks the appointment of pro bono counsel to represent Defendant and “a continuance in the case to allow time for the assignment of counsel.” *Id.* On July 24, 2025, Plaintiff’s counsel filed a letter representing that he and Defendant had been engaging in settlement discussions. *See* Dkt. 13. Accordingly, Plaintiff requests that the Court extend the deadline for Defendant to respond to the complaint. *See id.*


As a threshold matter, “[t]he Court is not authorized to appoint counsel to a corporation.” *Brand v. AIG Ins. Co.*, No. 15-cv-06286 (JMA) (GRB), 2016 WL 11501700, at \*2 (E.D.N.Y. July 19, 2016); *see also Kingvision Pay-Per View Ltd. v. DeJesus*, No. 05-cv-03682 (SJ) (RML), 2006 WL 941804, at \*3 (E.D.N.Y. Apr. 12, 2006) (“[T]he Court is not authorized to appoint counsel to a corporation because only natural persons may qualify for the benefit of the pro bono counsel appointment provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1).”). However, Defendant may be able to obtain guidance or a referral from the City Bar Justice Center, a private organization, which can be contacted by phone (212-382-4794) or email (fedprosdny@nycbar.org). Defendant is reminded “that a corporation may not appear in a lawsuit against it except through an attorney, and that, where a corporation repeatedly fails to appear by counsel, a default judgment may be entered against it.” *Commodity Futures Trading Comm’n v. McDonnell*, 332 F. Supp. 3d 641, 724 (E.D.N.Y. 2018) (quoting *Grace v. Bank Leumi Tr. Co. of N.Y.*, 443 F.3d 180, 192 (2d Cir. 2006)).

In order to provide Defendant additional time to search for counsel, and in light of Plaintiff’s representation that the parties are engaging in settlement discussions, the Court will grant Defendant an additional extension of the answer deadline. Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that Defendant shall file an answer or otherwise respond to the Complaint no later than **August 18, 2025**.

The Clerk of Court is respectfully directed to terminate the motion at Dkt. 13.

Dated: July 29, 2025  
New York, New York

SO ORDERED.

  
JENNIFER L. ROCHON  
United States District Judge